

## REMARKS

### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 63-67 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bailey. These claims have been deleted without prejudice.

### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 45-48 and 60-62 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deucher in view of Bailey.

Applicant submits that the claims, as amended, are patentable over Deucher and Bailey.

Deucher and Bailey in combination fail to teach or suggest that air can be recirculated from a rotating gantry through a housing back to an air conditioning system.

Deucher, in Figure 4, shows a plenum (five-sided frustum pyramidal shape on the left) through which air is pumped into a cavity 54 of a rotating gantry and from the cavity 54 through a radiator 48. Col. 5, lines 18-20 state as follows:

*"Hot air from annular region 56 is discharged into the room or can be connected to ceiling ducts which remove the heated air from the room."*

There is no suggestion in Deucher that air can follow a path from within the rotating gantry into a housing. Furthermore, there is no suggestion in Deucher that the air can follow a return path as claimed.

Bailey, in Fig. 3, discloses a return path for air through an air conditioner 140 and a housing. Bailey does not disclose that the air can flow into a rotating gantry 120. Specifically, Bailey does not disclose that the air can flow from within the rotating gantry 120 back to the housing.

Deucher and Bailey in combination thus fail to teach the feature that air can circulate through a confined volume in a gantry back to a housing around the gantry.

Claim 45 now specifically includes the limitation that the air follows a recirculation path “into the confined volume...through the radiator...into the housing...” Claim 45 thus includes at least one limitation that is not suggested by Deucher and Bailey in combination.

Applicant therefore submits that claim 45 is patentable over Deucher and Bailey. Applicant, accordingly, respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 45-48 and 60-62 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deucher in view of Bailey. Claims 61-62 have been deleted.

The Examiner also rejected claims 44 and 50-58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bailey in view of Deucher. These claims have either been deleted or have been changed to depend from claim 45.

Applicant, accordingly, respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 44 and 50-58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bailey in view of Deucher.

Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call Stephen M. De Klerk at (408) 720-8300.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account 02-2666 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicant hereby requests such an extension.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP



Stephen M. DeKlerk  
Reg. No. 46,503

Date: November 24, 2004

Customer No. 008791  
12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030  
(408) 720-8300